



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/646,924	09/25/2000	Eric Raspe	MERCK 2157	2859
23599	7590	06/15/2004	EXAMINER	
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			CHUNDURU, SURYAPRABHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1637	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/646,924

Applicant(s)

RASPE ET AL.

Examiner

Suryaprabha Chunduru

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12 and 14-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12 and 14-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants amendment and the response to the office action, filed on May 12, 2004 has been entered and considered.
2. Claims 2 and 13 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 8-9, 16 are amended. New claims 23-30 are added.
3. Applicants' response to the office action and amendment are fully considered and found persuasive in part.
4. With regard to the rejection made in the previous office action under 35 USC 112 second paragraph, applicants' amendment and arguments are fully considered and the rejection is withdrawn herein in view of the amendment.
5. With regard to the rejection in the previous office action under 35 USC 112 first paragraph, Applicants' amendment and response have been fully considered and found not persuasive. Applicants amended the independent claims to recite a location of response element of ROR α in the apo C-III promoter region (position -198 to +24). The amendment is fully considered and found persuasive regarding the narrow limitation. However, the structural limitation (specific sequence identity), that is, the specific the sequence identity, or the sequence structure involved in the promotion of the expression of apo C-III is not described. Further new claims recite overlapping positions -108/+24 of the apo C-III promoter. For which the structural limitation or sequence identity is not described for the response element of ROR α in the location of -198 to +24 of the apo C-III promoter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained herein for claims 1, 3-12, 14-22, herein. The rejection is rewritten herein, to include the new claim limitations.

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1,3-12, 14-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The current claims are drawn to a method for screening a substance for usefulness in the treatment of lipid metabolism dysfunction which comprises a ROR α receptor or a response element of ROR α located at position -198 to +24, and a overlapping position -108 to +24. The claims recite the position of a response element of the apo C-III promoter involved in the regulation of the apo C-III gene. The specification does not support structural identity or sequence of the response element that specifically regulates the expression of apo C-III gene , It is noted that in Fiers v. Sugano (25 USPQ2d, 1601), the Fed. Cir. concluded that "...if inventor is unable to envision detailed chemical structure of DNA sequence coding for specific protein, as well as method of obtaining it, then conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, that is, until after gene has been isolated...conception of any chemical substance, requires definition of that substance other than by its functional utility."

In the instant application, the response element of ROR α lacks such structural limitation and is not defined or described in the specification. The recitation of the position of a response

element does not provide what structural limitation is responsible for the apo C-III gene expression. Further, the positions of a response element would comprise any sequence with any sequence variation by addition, deletion, substitution or insertion of one or more bases, which could result in substantially a different regulatory effect on the apoC-III gene.

Also, in Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar (19 USPQ2d 1111, CAFC 1991), it was concluded that:

"...applicant must also convey, with reasonable clarity to those skilled in art, that applicant, as of filing date sought, was in possession of invention, with invention being, for purposes of "written description" inquiry, whatever is presently claimed."

In the instant case, the lack of structural limitation of the said ROR α constitutes lack of written description.

Conclusion

No claims are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suryaprabha Chunduru whose telephone number is 571-272-0783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30A.M. - 4.30P.M, Mon - Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and - for After Final communications.


Application/Control Number: 09/646,924

Page 5

Art Unit: 1637

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.


Suryaprabha Chunduru
June 3, 2004


JEFFREY FREDMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
